DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 341 CE 061 576

AUTHOR Grubb, W. Norton
TITLE Assessing the Coordination of Vocational Education with Other Federal Programs. Working Paper.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jun 92
CONTRACT V051A80004-91A
NOTE 67p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research in Vocational Education Materials Distribution Service, Horrabin Hall 46, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455 (order no. MDS-444: $2).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; Compliance (Legal); Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Surveys; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Carl D Perkins Voc and Appl Techn Educ Act 1990; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; National Apprenticeship Act 1937; Rehabilitation Act 1973; Wagner Peyser Act

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines the issues involved in coordination of services provided under the 1990 amendments to the Carl Perkins Act with those provided under the Adult Education Act, Job Training Partnership Act, National Apprenticeship Act, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Wagner-Peyser Act. It presents questions that could be addressed to state and local education officials to assess the extent of coordination of vocational programs with other federal programs. Section I describes the provisions related to coordination in the Perkins Amendments to clarify what federal legislation requires. Section II outlines different conceptions and models of coordination, distinguishing between the kinds of coordination that take place at the local level and those that come from state governments. Section III reviews existing research that, in theory, can be used as "benchmarks" to assess trends in coordination. The final section outlines the methods and general issues that guide the development of questions. Appendixes include 16 references and 4 sets of potential questions--both closed-ended and open-ended--designed to be administered by conventional survey methods to the state agency responsible for secondary vocational education; to the state agency responsible for community colleges, technical institutes, and other postsecondary institutions; to local education agencies; and to local postsecondary institutions. (YLB)

ED342341

NCRVE

National Center for Research in
Vocational Education

University of California, Berkeley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Working Paper

ASSESSING THE COORDINATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

W. Norton Grubb
University of California at Berkeley

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California at Berkeley
1995 University Avenue, Suite 375
Berkeley, CA 94704

Supported by
The Office of Vocational and Adult Education,
U.S. Department of Education

June, 1992 MDS-444

This document is one in a continuing series of Working Papers. It has not been reviewed by NCRVE; therefore, this paper represents the views of its author and not necessarily those of the Center or the U.S. Department of Education. This particular paper was prepared for the National Assessment of Vocational Education, U.S. Department of Education, in August, 1991. NCRVE makes these Working Papers available upon request for informational purposes.

CE061576

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Grant Number:	V051A80004-91A
Act under which Funds Administered:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act P. L. 98-524
Source of Grant:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20202
Grantee:	The Regents of the University of California National Center for Research in Vocational Education 1995 University Avenue, Suite 375 Berkeley, CA 94704
Director:	Charles S. Benson
Percent of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money:	100%
Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant:	$5,918,000

Disclaimer:

This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view of opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.

Discrimination:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

Prepared for the National Assessment of Vocational Education,
U.S. Department of Education
August 1991

ASSESSING THE COORDINATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

W. Norton Grubb
School of Education
The University of California, Berkeley

The 1990 Amendments to the Carl Perkins Act require the National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE) to "include descriptions and evaluations of . . . coordination of services under this Act, the Adult Education Act, the Job Training Partnership Act, the National Apprenticeship Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Wagner-Payser Act". This paper outlines the issues involved in coordination, and then presents questions that could be addressed to state and local education officials to assess the extent of coordination of vocational programs with other federal programs.

It is critical at the outset to recognize the possibilities and limits imposed by the methodology that NAVE will use. By definition, coordination is an activity that involves two or more institutions. Normally, therefore, judging the extent of coordination involves gathering information from all parties — i.e., from both a community college and from a local JTPA agency. However, because the National Assessment will focus on vocational education, it will survey local educational institutions providing vocational education as well as state education agencies; therefore other agencies which are partners in coordination — i.e., JTPA agencies, welfare agencies, Job Service programs, and the like — will not be surveyed. Therefore it will be impossible to develop a complete picture of coordination.

On the other hand, there have been relatively few surveys of coordination activity, particularly at the local level — in part because most

researchers have used case study methods. Therefore NAVE's surveys will be useful in describing more completely that prior efforts the extent to which vocational education participates in other federal programs. The survey will be, so to speak, a census of coordination activities.

The first section of the paper describes the provisions related to coordination in the Perkins Amendments, to clarify what federal legislation requires. The second section outlines different conceptions and models of coordination, distinguishing between the kinds of coordination that take place at the local level and those that come from state governments. The third section reviews research that has been done in the past — research that in theory can be used as "benchmarks" to assess trends in coordination. The final section outlines the methods and general issues that guide the development of questions, with potential questions presented in an appendix.

I. Potential Effects of the Perkins Amendments

One crucial question for NAVE is what effects the Perkins Amendments might have on coordination. The original Carl Perkins Act contained a number of coordination requirements (Lewis, 1986). Most of them were procedural, for example requiring notification of state and local JTPA programs about planning and specifying that individuals representing JTPA w must be represented on various boards. Most of these requirements were unchanged in the 1990 Amendments to the Perkins Act.

JTPA legislation added other coordination requirements. As in the case of the Perkins Act, most of them were procedural and related to joint planning. However, one important exception was the inclusion of a set-aside equal to eight percent of funds allocated to states, "to provide financial assistance to any State education agency responsible for education and training — (1) to provide services for eligible participants through cooperative agreements between such State educational agency or agencies; and (2) to facilitate coordination of education and training services for eligible participants through such cooperative agreements" (Section 123). While the 8-percent funds have in practice been used for a variety of purposes (Grubb et al., 1990), their clear intention was to foster cooperation between JTPA and educational institutions.

The recent JOBS program included in the Family Support Act of 1988 has its own addition to coordination requirements, including the following:

(1) "The Governor of each State shall assure that program activities under this part are coordinated with programs operated under the Job Training Partnership Act and with any other relevant employment, training, and education programs available in that State."

(2) The state plan required for each state's JOBS program must be submitted to the State Job Training Coordinating Council for review and comment, and these comments must then be transmitted to the governor.

(3) The state agency administering the JOBS program — normally, the state welfare agency — must "consult with the State education agency and the agency responsible for administering job training programs in the State in order to promote coordination of the planning and delivery of services under the program with programs operated under the Job Training Partnership Act and with education programs available in the State (including any program under the Adult Education Act or the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act)."

The recent Perkins Amendments have not added substantially to coordination requirements. There are several provisions related to federal agencies:

- A requirements to form an Interdepartmental Task Force on Vocational Education and Related Programs (Section 4).
- A requirement that the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee include representation from various federal departments, while the associated State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees must also include representatives of vocational education, JTPA, and various other agencies (Section 422).
- The vocational education data system established by the Secretary of Education must be compatible with JTPA, and with other occupational demand and supply information systems supported by federal funds (Section 421).

Most of the requirements failing on states are procedural:

- The state board for vocational education is responsible for procedures for coordination with the State Job Training Coordinating Council (Section 111).
- States must assure that recipients of federal funds comply with provision of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Education of the Handicapped Act regarding access to programs (Section 111(c)).
- States must provide lists of recipients of federal funds to local Private Industry Councils (PICs) (Section 111(e)).
- The State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) must include one representative from the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) and must give "due consideration" to individuals who serve on local PICs (Section 112). The SCOVE also reports on the integration and coordination of vocational education with the job training system at least once every two years.
- The planning periods for state plans must be conterminous with JTPA planning periods (section 113).
- The state Committee of Practitioners must be named in consultation with members of local PICs (section 115).
- The performance measures developed by the Committee of Practitioners must be consistent with those adopted by JTPA and JOBS Programs (Section 115(c)).

Finally, there is a procedural requirement falling on local educational agencies:

- Local plans must describe procedures to coordinate vocational education with JTPA "in order to avoid duplication and to expand the range of and accessibility to vocational education services" (Section 240).

The requirements described so far are designed to promote *cooperative planning*, and may have nothing to do with *cooperative service delivery*. In particular, none of them cover funding arrangements, without which coordination is difficult to achieve.

There are in addition a number of provisions in the Perkins Amendments that allow or encourage cooperative service delivery, however,

particularly by allowing (though not requiring) Perkins funds to be used by community-based organizations, proprietary schools, and other institutions which are often training providers to JTPA and JOBS:

• Section 235(c)(2)(n) allows federal funds to be directed to "private vocational training institutions, private postsecondary educational institutions, employers, labor organizations, and and joint labor-management apprenticeship programs whenever [they] can make a significant contribution to obtaining the objectives of the State plan and can provide substantially equivalent training at lesser cost, or can provide equipment of services not available in public institutions".

• Title II, Part A — the section that supports special programs — authorizes funding for community-based organizations to provide support programs for vocational education. This allows financing for the kinds of support services that JTPA and JOBS have provided, and could in theory be used to combine such services from JTPA and JOBS organizations with classroom vocational education.

• Title II, Part II authorizes funds for business-labor-education partnerships (including apprenticeships and internships in industry), with the requirement that there be incentives for coordination between such partnerships and JTPA programs.

• Title II, Part G authorizes Community Education Employment Centers, for low-income youth, which appear to be "one-stop" centers for a variety of education , training, and support services similar to the "one-stop shopping" centers that have sometimes been created by states (described below in Section II). These Centers have Councils of Advisors which must include a representative of the local PIC, and the Council must make recommendations regarding coordination with JTPA.

• Section 413 authorizes the Secretary of Education to establish demonstration programs for dislocated workers through organizations eligible under JTPA. In theory such programs could be coordinated with dislocated workers programs funded by JTPA.

• Section 420A authorizes cooperative demonstration programs for a variety of purposes including examples of "successful cooperation between the private sector and public agencies", grants to community-based organizations in partnership with educational institutions, and agricultural

action centers that must be coordinated with programs under Title III of JTPA. These funds could therefore be used to fund innovative forms of local collaboration.

• Section 511 allows Perkins funds to be used to provide additional funding to programs funded by Sections 123, Title II, and Title III of JTPA and to programs supported by the Wagner-Payser Act (which supports the Employment Service). This clarifies that state discretionary funds can be used to augment funding of JTPA and the Employment Service, potentially improving joint service delivery. In practice, however, the Perkins Amendments reduce the amounts of state discretionary funds in favor of greater allocations to local districts and institutions, and it seems unlikely that many states will take advantage of this particular provision.

In sum, the coordination requirements of the Perkins Amendments are not especially novel. Most are procedural requirements, facilitating joint planning. The provisions authorizing funding that could be used to support joint service delivery include several general provisions, allowing states to support community-based organizations, JTPA programs, and the Employment Service; and several demonstration programs (including those of Part II). To determine the use states and localities make of the flexibility allowed by the Perkins Amendments, it is appropriate to ask them whether they have allocated funds under Sections 235(c)(2)(N) and other sections allowing demonstration projects. (See questions I.11 to I.16, III.9, and IV.22.) To evaluate the effects of various demonstration projects on coordination, however, it would be more efficient to conduct case studies of the particular projects funded by the Secretary of Education and the uses to which these funds have been put (though question I.11 to I.16 asks whether states have received any of these funds).

In light of the requirement that NAVE assess coordination of vocational education with services funded by "the Adult Education Act, the Job Training Partnership Act, the National Apprenticeship Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Wagner-Payser Act", it is worth noting that almost all the coordination provisions of the Perkins Amendments refer to JTPA. The Adult Education Act is never mentioned in the legislation; the National Apprenticeship Act is mentioned only in the definition of apprenticeship programs (Section 521), which are specifically eligible for

funding both in general uses of local funds (Section 235(C)(2)(J)) and in various demonstration programs. The Rehabilitation Act of of 1973 is mentioned only in the requirement that programs for the handicapped comply with this Act (Section 111(c)). Curiously enough, the JOBS program is never mentioned in the Perkins Amendments, and all the references to welfare-related programs pertain to federal-level coordination efforts like the Interdepartmental Task Force on Coordination. If one reads the Perkins Act literally, coordination with JTPA programs counts the most, and coordination with other programs is quite unimportant.

In the analysis that follows, and the questions presented in the appendix, there is an emphasis on coordination between vocational education and JTPA, since that form of coordination is the main emphasis of the Perkins Amendments. There are fewer questions related to other federal programs. Despite the lack of attention in the Perkins Amendments to the JOBS program, this program is — next to JTPA — the federal program with the most potential for collaborating with vocational education, and therefore questions related to JOBS have been included.

Finally, it is unreasonable to expect that the Perkins Amendments themselves will stimulate additional coordination, because there have been so few changes. Instead of an analysis of how the Perkins Amendments have changed coordination activities, the NAVE assessment of coordination between vocational education and other federal programs should be interpreted as a kind of census, an effort to determine the extent of coordination that now exists.

II. Conceptions of Coordination

Interest in coordination never seems to die. The reason seems to be that coordination promises both greater efficiency and greater effectiveness in federally-sponsored programs. Greater efficiency could result because coordination could eliminate duplication of services — a source of constant concern in Congress. Efficiency could also result from more clients being served with the same resources.[1] Greater effectiveness could develop because

[1] On the other hand, the costs associated with coordination could actually reduce the efficiency of programs. In federal and state efforts to promote coordination, there is a consistent reluctance to acknowledge the costs of coordination.

combining services from different programs — for example, classroom-based education from vocational education, support services from JTPA, and placement services from the Job Service — may be more effective than any of the components individually. The result of these promises has been an endless series of efforts at both the federal and state levels to enhance coordination.

While improved coordination is therefore a common goal, those involved in administering programs do not use the term consistently (Trutko, Bailis, and Barnow, 1989; Hickey, 1986). It is therefore necessary to define the term more precisely, before proceeding to determine how much coordination there might be, or whether coordination is improving or not. Bailis (1987) has distinguished *collaborative planning*, in which individuals from different programs confer jointly about their plans, from *collaborative service delivery*, in which different programs cooperate in some way in the provision of services. Collaborative planning is a prerequisite to collaborative service delivery, but joint planning — including the notification of activities, sign-off requirements, and joint membership on various boards and planning groups — may take place without service delivery being changed in any way. Because the efficiencies and potentially greater effectiveness associated with coordination can come about only with changes in service delivery, collaborative service delivery is necessary to achieve either the efficiency or the effectiveness promised by better coordination (Grubb et al., 1990). In assessing the current status of coordination, it is therefore necessary to distinguish between the two carefully.

Coordination at the Local Level

At the local level where services are delivered, coordination in service delivery takes a bewildering variety of forms; Grubb et al. (1989 and 1990) and Trutko, Bailis, and Barnow (1989) provide a variety of illustrations and case studies. Despite the variety of efforts, it is possible to discern patterns. Research performed by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) has identified eight models or approaches in their studies of coordination among vocational education, JTPA, and welfare-to-work programs (drawn from Grubb et al., 1989 and 1990):

Model 1: Subcontracts with providers of vocational education

By far the most common kind of cooperation between vocational education, JTPA, and welfare-to-work programs occurs when JTPA (or JOBS) uses community colleges, technical institutes, area vocational schools, and adult schools to provide vocational training. Often the educational institution has a subcontract with the local Service Delivery Area (SDA) and provides classes specifically for JTPA clients. In other cases, SDAs refer individuals to community colleges and technical institutes without a formal contract. The individual referral method works well for SDAs that have comparatively few clients in classroom training, but some SDAs make extensive referrals to public education.

While there has not been a census of JTPA referrals to vocational education, it is clear that the vast majority of SDAs send clients to vocational education programs. The National Alliance of Business reported that 95 percent of SDAs have some financial agreement with a provider of vocational education (Brady and Balfe, 1987). A recent study of 15 representative SDAs found that almost all of them depend on public educational institutions — community colleges, technical institutes, and skill centers operated by school districts — for their classroom training. In fact, only two of the fifteen SDAs relied heavily on proprietary schools, and none used community-based organizations for occupational skills training (Kogan et al., 1989, Ch. 2), though in other areas CBOs are extensively used.[2] Similarly, a survey of community colleges and technical institutes has revealed that 53 percent have a contract for training or some other service with JTPA (Lynch, Palmer, and Grubb, 1991), with colleges reporting that they most often provide assessment, counseling, job search skills, remedial education, and credit vocational courses to JTPA clients. In addition, 21 percent of institutions reported that they were the administrative entity for JTPA in their area, a relatively high figure.

Although educational institutions perform a wide variety of services for JTPA, it is most common for these institutions to provide classroom education, including both remedial education and occupational skills training. Typically, recruitment, assessment, and placement are performed by

---

[2] In the study of eight communities in Grubb and McDonnell (1991), two — Philadelphia and Scranton — rely extensively on CBOs for skill training.

other agencies. In fact, when community colleges and other postsecondary institutions provide a wide variety of services in addition to classroom training, SDAs sometimes complain about the quality of those services. This perception of the strengths and weaknesses of vocational institutions reflects a historical specialization of function: vocational programs have always provided classroom instruction, but typically they have not been engaged in recruiting the kinds of students eligible for JTPA. Nor do they have strong job placement services.

When SDAs contract with vocational institutions for classroom training, the schools and colleges usually receive state aid for the JTPA clients they enroll.[3] This funding mechanism has several consequences. First, it increases the fiscal incentive for vocational institutions to cooperate with JTPA because doing so will increase their enrollments and state funding.[4] Second, it *potentially* increases the resources in the job training system: often JTPA funding covers the excess costs associated with smaller classes, extra tutoring, counseling, remediation, and additional monitoring and paperwork, while the educational institution covers the "normal" costs of instruction through state funding. Third, it allows publicly funded institutions to charge JTPA less than community-based organizations and proprietary vocational schools must, since the latter lack public funding. In many SDAs, there is substantial price competition among potential providers of job training, particularly given the JTPA performance standards related to costs (such as cost per entered employment). Therefore, public funding gives community colleges and technical institutes a competitive edge — and

---

[3] State aid to both secondary and postsecondary institutions is typically allocated on the basis of average daily attendance (ADA) or full-time equivalent students (FTE), and these state funds are often referred to as ADA or FTE funds. The exception occurs in states like Massachusetts and Florida, where community colleges receive appropriations that are not precisely related to attendance. In these cases, institutions do not have any fiscal incentive to increase their enrollments of JTPA clients. In some other states, there are differences in state aid that affect institutions wanting to contract with JTPA. For example, California pays less for non-credit courses than for credit courses, so that enrollments in the non-credit short-term programs more compatible with JTPA — like those in Fresno's Vocational Training Center or in the state's Regional Occupation Centers and Programs — generate less funding than enrollments in regular community college vocational courses. In addition, the state has imposed a limit or cap on the enrollments it will support; in community colleges at their caps, there are no fiscal incentives to increase enrollments from JTPA.

[4] This incentive does not operate if, as in California, there is a limit or cap on the enrollments that generate state revenue.

generates some complaints from private schools and CBOs about unfair competition.

When community colleges and technical institutes charge JTPA less than their total costs because of state funding, then the total resources available to each JTPA client may or may not be higher than when SDAs subcontract with community-based organizations. In effect, this approach to coordination is one in which state revenues are substituted for federal resources, allowing more JTPA-eligible individuals to be served with the available federal resources. Except in a few cases, it is difficult to determine the relative amounts of state and federal resources combined in this model. In Minnesota, the state pays 75 percent of the costs of postsecondary education when JTPA clients enroll in technical institutes, while JTPA pays the remaining 25 percent plus costs of some support services. At the same time, many JTPA clients also receive state and federal student financial aid, increasing the state and the federal resources invested in these individuals. In general, the state resources used for JTPA clients enrolled in public schools appear to be substantial. Therefore, this pattern of funding converts what is nominally a federally-funded program into a state-federal program, even though the magnitude of state contributions is typically unknown and no state policies govern the use of the funds.

Model 2: Systematic allocation of functions to specific institutions

In several communities, a mechanism has been developed to allocate particular services to the providers most capable of delivering them, or to direct individuals to the programs best suited to their needs and interests. An example is that of Richland Community College in Illinois. The college serves as a liaison between the JTPA system and the vocational education community. All JTPA clients who need vocational training are referred to the community college, which then determines which institution would best serve the individual. (The college also coordinates all funds for adult basic education and GED programs for the SDA.) Although such systematic methods of allocating responsibilities to different programs appear to be relatively rare, many programs believe that such arrangements would be ideal. For example, the Miami SDA — which has discovered that community-based organizations are strong in recruitment and job placement,

while local adult schools provide better classroom training — is trying to develop a mechanism for such an allocation of resources.

Model 3: Using JTPA to provide support services in colleges and technical institutes

Another form of coordination is the use of JTPA funds to provide support services — child care, transportation, counseling, assessment, remediation, and sometimes stipends — to students at community colleges and technical institutes. This routinely occurs when an SDA sends its clients to such institutions; but educational institutions may take a somewhat different approach and enroll their JTPA-eligible students in JTPA so the students can receive support services that are not available through the school. Because many postsecondary vocational programs enroll large numbers of low-income and other JTPA-eligible students (especially displaced homemakers), this approach could potentially increase services for many postsecondary vocational students.

This approach to collaboration has the same outcome as JTPA subcontracts with community colleges and technical institutes for training, but there are important differences. In both cases, individuals receive vocational training and ancillary services funded by both JTPA and the state. But in this model, students already enrolled in postsecondary institutions are identified as JTPA-eligible and then receive JTPA services. In the models previously described, individuals recruited through the JTPA system are directed to postsecondary training. There may be selection effects depending on how the client enters this training/support service system. JTPA-eligible individuals who enroll in postsecondary institutions on their own may be more motivated or better prepared for college than those recruited through JTPA. There may also be a difference in the training available for clients enrolling through JTPA and for those who enroll first in postsecondary schools: JTPA is likely to direct individuals to short-term, intensive non-credit programs, whereas JTPA-eligible individuals already enrolled in postsecondary institutions are more likely to be in regular certificate and Associate programs.

Although there are many examples of this approach to collaboration, we suspect that it is less common than SDA subcontracts with community colleges to provide classroom training. One reason for this is that

expenditures for support services from Title II-A is limited to 15 percent of those funds. In a recent study of fifteen SDAs, one third of them provided very few supportive services, and only four out of the fifteen provided extensive services (Kogan et al., 1989, Ch. II). It is unlikely, therefore, that many SDAs will have sufficient funds for support services to assist individuals referred to JTPA by educational institutions.

Historically, job training programs have attached greater importance to support services than have education programs. More precisely, educational institutions have provided certain services — assessment, counseling, tutoring, and remediation — while other services — especially child care, transportation, work-related clothing and materials, and stipends — have been provided by JTPA but rarely by educational institutions. However, community colleges and technical institutes are increasingly aware of the importance of support services, partly in response to increases in dropout rates, and partly as a result of increased enrollment of JTPA and welfare-to-work program clients, whose access to support services has made the absence of such services for "regular" students more obvious. Increased support services have come from statewide initiatives, such as the California matriculation system to provide assessment and counseling to all entering students and the North Carolina network of Participant Service Centers. Still, vocational education programs have limited budgets for support services, so that educational institutions may continue to seek modest amounts of JTPA funds to provide such services to eligible individuals.

Model 4: Customized training that includes JTPA clients

Another model of coordination occurs when community colleges and technical institutes provide customized training for particular firms, and then include JTPA-eligible clients in such training programs. Typically, customized training programs are supported with a variety of public and private funds. In most all cases, the private firms make substantial contributions to pay for the training (Lynch, Palmer, and Grubb, 1991). Nearly all states have publicly-funded programs specifically for customized training, usually as part of their economic development initiatives. The best-known examples of these programs include the Employment Training Panel in California and the Bay State Skills Corporation in Massachusetts, and its

progeny in other states such as the Sunshine State Skills Corporation in Florida and the Bluegrass State Skills Corporation in Kentucky.

Although most customized training programs do not systematically include JTPA clients — because the individuals enrolled tend to be firm employees — there are some examples of coordinated activities. Customized training programs lend themselves to coordination with JTPA because they are typically shorter than certificate and Associate programs and, thus more compatible with JTPA standards of program duration and cost. In addition, customized training has a built-in job placement mechanism: the sponsoring firm tends to hire a high proportion of those completing customized training.

Differences in outlook can impede the operation of this model. Customized training programs are "business-oriented," or primarily concerned with facilitating hiring and productivity for employers, rather than being "welfare-oriented," or primarily concerned with improving the employment of the poor and unemployed. In some areas, customized training programs are reluctant to include JTPA individuals because of the negative attitudes of many business people about JTPA, which they perceive as enrolling low-ability individuals unprepared for work. (However, this stigma is not ubiquitous: some SDAs have established good relationships with particular firms that are experienced with JTPA.) These differences in outlook can be minimized. For example, some PICs consider themselves to be very business-oriented, with members of the business community playing an active role in the PIC.

Model 5: Integrating funds in new institutions

Yet another model of coordination emerges when new institutions are established that combine funds from several different programs. One such example is the Job Service Center in Bingen, Washington, which has developed into a one-stop training and placement center. The center provides all JTPA services, welfare-to-work programs, a dislocated worker program, ESL, Adult Basic Education sponsored by two community colleges, alternative courses for high school students, and GED preparation. Another example of this coordination model is the Dakota County Employment and Training Center in Minnesota, which is operated by a technical institute. However, these centers do not have to be operated by educational institutions: the Anoka County Job Training Center (Minnesota) operates a

variety of programs with many funding sources, but it is a county department that serves as the administrative entity for the SDA. Thus, these hybrid institutions can be initiated in many ways, but they all draw together funds from various sources.

Model 6: Enhancing services to high school students

The most common pattern of collaboration between JTPA and high schools involves programs to assist students at risk of dropping out. In fact, a majority of SDAs seem to offer such programs. The Summer Training and Employment Program (STEP), a national demonstration project operating in many states, is one example. Potential dropouts enroll in the JTPA summer youth program, during which they attend remedial education classes in the morning and JTPA-subsidized work experience in the afternoon. During the school year, JTPA-funded counselors provide students with support, tutoring, and encouragement. In Miami, a JTPA-funded dropout prevention program works with the schools to identify youth most likely to drop out; it then provides summer employment, as an incentive to interest individuals in the program, and also provides counselors to work with these students during the school year. The counselors, who have case loads of only two students, provide tutoring, career counseling, and advice about the myriad problems of daily life. In Illinois, Danville High School runs a work-study program for 14- and 15-year olds, offering part-time jobs (funded by JTPA) combined with counseling and a high school employability skills class.

These programs generally combine JTPA funding with regular support through the school system (including attendance-based or "ADA" funds from the state) because the clients are still enrolled in high school. As is true of contracts between JTPA and postsecondary education, JTPA contracts with high schools convert what is nominally a federal program — JTPA — into a program with federal, state, and local support. (It is probably more appropriate to view this as JTPA funds supplementing school budgets rather than state resources supplementing the JTPA program, because the "clients" in this case are high school students.)

In some cases this approach to cooperation results in real collaboration; for example, schools provide additional counseling and tutoring while JTPA provides other support services. In some examples, however, school districts use JTPA funds in ways that, although they benefit students, do not

particularly enhance cooperation. For example, one JTPA program recruits youth who have left school and re-enrolls them in high school. The school district thereby increases its ADA funding from the state. The district keeps half the ADA funds generated and gives the other half to community-based organizations that use the ADA with regular JTPA funding to provide alternative education and training. Everyone seems to benefit from this arrangement. High school dropouts receive education that they would otherwise not have received. The school district's dropout rate is lower and it gets to keep one half of the state ADA funds it would have lost if the student was not enrolled. The community-based organizations that provide education and training have more resources to serve a difficult population. Finally, the SDA can demonstrate that it has cooperated with the schools in devising an innovative program for dropouts. However, in this particular case the entire initiative has come from JTPA; the high school's role is to serve as a conduit for state revenue, not to cooperate in the provision of education, training, or related services.

When JTPA works with high schools, the most apparent benefit is that a relatively small number of individuals receive relatively intense services — including remediation, counseling, reduced class sizes, and motivation to stay in school (through the inducement of summer employment) — which the schools cannot afford to provide for the entire high school population. In some cases, JTPA operates to replace an educational institution (regular high school) that has failed some of its clients (dropouts). Perhaps because of differences in approach, philosophy, class size, teacher-pupil ratios, or the characteristics of the instructors, JTPA may have a better chance than the regular high school of success with potential dropouts.

Model 7: Community college administration of JTPA

In a small number of states, community colleges administer JTPA programs. In theory, this approach provides an opportunity for excellent coordination between vocational education and JTPA because it should eliminate turf battles and institutional barriers and enhance the good personal relationships associated with good coordination. Easier communication between JTPA and college administrators — now colleagues — should facilitate cooperative arrangements, especially for the enrollment of JTPA clients in postsecondary vocational education and the referral of

JTPA-eligible community college students to JTPA services. Yet another theory is that community college administration of JTPA would lead colleges to capture more JTPA funds for their institutions than is appropriate. For example, a college-run SDA might eliminate effective community-based organizations or adult schools as JTPA contractors or neglect on-the-job training despite its potential efficacy.

However, the assumption that community college administration should improve coordination proves not to be automatically true. When community colleges operate SDAs, they are still subject to the powerful incentives imposed by performance standards and funding constraints; on the whole, therefore, this form of administration seems to have little impact on the kinds of services provided. However, there is considerable variation among the SDAs operated by colleges. The results of community college administration of SDAs depend on how the college organizes the SDA office and how much authority is granted the SDA by the PIC. Where community colleges have established JTPA administrative offices that are physically and organizationally close to the rest of the college, the collaboration seems to be closer. Administrative offices that are physically separate and administratively distinct from the rest of the college often are indistinguishable from other kinds of local administrative entities.

Model 8: Consolidation of decision-making power

A final approach to coordination is the consolidation of regional decision-making power over multiple sources of funding. This is the model for the Regional Employment Boards (REBs) in Massachusetts. When fully operational, REBs will make decisions about the use of funds from a variety of federal and state programs and allocate these resources to local service providers. Recently, the Hartford (Connecticut) area has developed a Joint Policy Board that controls funds from JTPA, the Perkins Act, the welfare system, and a state-funded program, and allocates these funds to local providers. This model may facilitate a rational allocation of education and training responsibilities among potential service providers.[5]

---

[5] See "Request for Proposals to Provide Year-Round Education, Employment, and Training Services," Hartford Service Delivery Area, (January 5, 1989).

In this model, a substate entity receives a variety of federal and state funds, including JTPA, Perkins, and welfare funds; revenues from state economic development, education, and training initiatives; the funding for the Employment Service; and vocational rehabilitation money. This regional entity then decides which local service providers will receive funding from this large pot of money. Local providers can then create programs to meet the special needs of a specific population and concentrate on providing the specified services, rather than focusing on creating programs to comply with the diverse (and sometimes conflicting) administrative requirements of various state and federal funding sources. Funded agencies can include public education institutions, private proprietary schools, community-based organizations, unions, firms, and the entire range of providers usually funded by JTPA. The substate entity differs from regional coordination boards because it actually administers funds and chooses service providers, rather than merely acting as an advisor. Such an agency differs from existing SDAs because it has control over more types of funds.

In theory, this approach has many advantages. The substate entity is more familiar with local employment conditions than are state offices; it knows about the characteristics of the local population in need of education and training; and it is familiar with the strengths and weakness of local providers. Therefore, this agency can consider all factors in its decisions about what population to serve, the types of education and training to offer, and which organizations to fund. When the regional entity discovers combinations of training, education, and support services that meet the needs of the local labor market and clients, it can fund these services, rather than having to rely on coordination among institutions with competing priorities. This can be far more rational than the more common system in which these decisions are made in isolation from each other — some by state and some by local administrators.

Despite these potential advantages, one possible flaw in this approach to coordination is immediately evident. The vast majority of funding for vocational education and job training does not flow from vocational education and job training legislation, but from general funding for secondary and postsecondary educational institutions. As long as these funds remain outside the control of the regional funding entity, or any coordination board, then problems of coordinating the regular programs of high schools, area

vocational schools, community colleges, and postsecondary technical institutes with the programs funded by the regional entity may persist. In addition, whether or not a regional entity can surmount the pressures of local politics — a problem which has seriously affected the coordination of vocational education and JTPA in some cities — remains to be seen.

In sum, there is a variety of approaches to coordination at the local level. Of course, these approaches are not equally common. JTPA subcontracts with community colleges and other postsecondary vocational institutions appear very common, while several of the other models are comparatively rare. However, it is difficult to know how common various approaches are, the the survey that NAVE undertakes should provide the first evidence of how widespread different approaches to coordination are.

In assessing the status of coordination, it is common to list the factors which encourage coordination and those which impede it. Among those factors which enhance coordination, the following emerge as important (based on the review by Trutko, Bailis, and Barnow, 1989, and Brady and Balfe, 1986):

- Political support from the state and federal levels, and support from agency and community leaders.
- Cooperative attitudes among administrators at the state and local levels.
- Strong personalities in positions of leadership.
- Decreases in funding and shortages of funding, forcing agencies to cooperate to serve clients with dwindling resources.
- The availability of funds earmarked for coordination, like the JTPA 8-percent funds.
- Common goals of different agencies.
- A prior history of coordination.
- Mechanisms to build consensus and resolve conflicts.
- Co-location of facilities.
- Evidence that coordinated programs are more effective.

Symmetrically, the barriers to coordination include the following:

- Restrictions on eligibility in various programs.
- Restrictions on how funds can be used.
- Requirements related to client confidentiality.
- Personal difficulties in working with staff from other agencies.
- Different geographic boundaries of administrative units.
- Incompatible forms, data requirements, accounting procedures, and management information systems.
- Different fiscal years.
- Fear of loss of autonomy, distrust of other agencies.
- Lack of political or administrative support.
- Lack of time and effort required to plan and implement coordination, since coordination is usually treated as something which can be obtained for free.

However, the emphasis on personal difficulties, procedural incompatibilities, and bureaucratic requirements overlooks some of the most important, structural barriers to coordination. Among the most important of these are the following (drawn from Grubb et al., 1991):

- Different conceptions of purpose and choice of services: For example, vocational educators prefer to think of themselves as "educators", and offer certificate and Associate programs lasting one to two years. Those in JTPA tend to scorn this approach as a "Cadillac model" and to see their roles as providing short-term training — six to sixteen weeks — to get individuals into the labor market quickly. In addition, many JTPA agencies, under pressure to meet cost per placement standards, have put a majority of their training funds into on-the-job training provided by employers, effectively precluding much cooperation with vocational education. Similarly, many welfare-to-work programs have concentrated on job search assistance, remedial education, and very short-term training, again precluding much cooperation with vocational education. These basic differences about the kinds of services that individuals need are rooted in basic conceptions of program goals that cannot be readily changed by increasing coordination requirements.
- Dissatisfaction with particular providers of vocational education: In some areas, JTPA and welfare-to-work programs have been dissatisfied with

community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools which they perceive to be unresponsive to their needs and clients. This frequently happens, for example, where a community colleges is transfer-oriented, and offers standard semester-length courses on conventional academic schedules. Those community colleges that have devised shorter courses, flexible hours, and open-entry/open-exit courses, and those that have established student service centers providing assessment, remediation, tutoring, and counseling which can be especially helpful to JTPA and JOBS clients, are more often perceived as potential partners. Another common criticism of vocational education concerns its lack of emphasis on job placement (see Kogan et al., Ch. 2). Some community colleges and technical institutes have increased job placement assistance for JTPA clients to overcome this problem; but in other SDAs, where colleges have weak job placement services, JTPA simply relies less on educational institutions.

• Local Politics: Finally, local politics can be a major barrier to coordination between vocational education and JTPA. Some SDAs are effectively controlled by the community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide client services for them (see Cook, 1986; Arthur Young, 1988). These CBOs often have considerable influence because they represent certain constituencies with organized political power, such as blacks, Hispanics, or Asian-Americans; white ethnic or neighborhood groups; women; or the disabled. While these community groups do not substantially influence most local decisions, many were organized advocates and service providers during CETA, and they are especially vocal about poverty and employment issues, including the welfare and job training services. In some cities, local politics have become pathological as these groups have come to treat job training programs as employment centers for their own members. Under such conditions, it is impossible for an SDA to allocate funds based on the needs of clients, the nature of local labor markets, and the quality of service providers in the community, and it can be almost impossible for educational institutions in such communities to collaborate with JTPA since the SDA is under political pressure to direct resources to CBOs.

In surveys of local educational institutions such as those that NAVE will carry out, it will be difficult to determine which of the many barriers to coordination are most powerful, partly because the NAVE surveys provide

no way of checking on the accuracy of the responses. Nonetheless, in the issues developed in Section IV and the questions presented in the Appendix, there are several devised to determine what remaining to coordination exist.

Coordination at the State Level

A different issue is the nature of coordination at the state level. States have considerable authority over their educational systems. In terms of federal programs, they can establish more powerful state policies under JTPA than they could under CETA, and the JOBS program gives considerable authority to states. Still, many states are dominated by an ethos of local control; in these cases, states may do little more to coordinate vocational education and other federal programs than comply with federal requirements. Generally, states go beyond the federal coordination requirements and influence local coordination in two ways: through their requirements for the use of 8-percent funds; through the establishment of state-specific institutions and practices that enhance coordination; and through the development of other state policies that affect coordination, even if unintentionally.

State Priorities for 8-percent Funds

JTPA legislation includes an 8-percent education coordination set-aside, "to provide services for eligible participants through cooperative agreements" and "to facilitate coordination of education and training services." Even in states without aggressive state policies, the 8-percent funds provide an opportunity to enhance coordination. However, the federal definitions of "cooperative agreements" and "coordination" are vague (Bailis, 1988). As a result, states' interpretations of these concepts have resulted in extremely different uses of the 8-percent set-aside (Grubb et al, 1991). While the 8-percent funds support a variety of innovative programs and many collaborative efforts between vocational programs and JTPA, they are not consistently used for coordination with public education programs.

One appropriate question for NAVE surveys, then, covers how states have used their 8-percent funds. However, Congress is in the process of reauthorizing the JTPA legislation, and draft legislation has eliminated the 8-percent set-aside in favor of a set-aside that allows a greater variety of

coordination activities. It is possible, then, that this particular coordination mechanism will be eliminated by the time NAVE surveys are undertaken.

State Coordination Policies

Several states have adopted their own, strong policies toward coordination. For example, Massachusetts began consolidating responsibility for various education and training programs in a single agency, the Department of Employment and Training, governed by a single board. and other states have toyed with the idea of such a super-agency. (Indeed, early drafts of the Perkins Amendments replaced a variety of governing boards by a single board that would have authority over various federal funds.) In the Massachusetts approach, a single state-level agency is matched by what might be termed a "local super-agency" which decides what local priorities are and what local providers of education and training should receive state and federal funds. In theory, such a policy would replace the existing hodge-podge of programs with a single state agency and single local entity, providing complete coordination among programs. In practice, such consolidated agencies are unlikely to include all relevant funding and may not have complete powers, so coordination problems are likely to remain.

More common than creating such state superagencies is the development of substate units to convene the different institutions in the education and training system. For example, Michigan has Designated Education Planning Entities, Florida has Regional Coordinating Councils, Illinois has Regional Vocational Delivery Systems (primarily to coordinate secondary vocational education but extending to JTPA as well), and Massachusetts has six regional education centers. These regional entities serve advisory functions; they have no administrative authority or control over resource allocations. Of course, these are examples of state practice to impose stronger *collaborative planning*, and cannot force *collaborative service delivery* if local programs are resistant or if there are other conditions preventing local collaboration.

Some states have fostered collaborative planning in still others ways. For example, Illinois requires all SDAs to have formal coordination agreements with all education agencies in their jurisdiction, the local welfare office, and the office for rehabilitative services, and all SDAs must convene quarterly coordination meetings with the service agencies in their areas,

including community college districts, the Department of Rehabilitative Services, the Department of Public Aid, the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Employment Security (Job Service), and the Department of Aging. A similar approach in the state of Washington assigns agencies to one of three levels of coordination: Level 1 coordination (containing the most stringent requirements) requires signed agreements between all SDAs and certain specified public agencies in the area; Level 2 coordination requires documentation of ways SDAs will consult with other agencies; and Level 3 coordination requires sharing information about programs and services. Although this policy is intended to enhance cooperative planning, the system may have little effect on the development of cooperative service delivery because these requirements are aimed only at increasing communication and referrals among agencies.

Another common practice is to fund statewide coordination activities, usually through 8-percent funds. For example, Georgia supports four regional coordinators who help PICs and educational institutions apply for funds, and a JTPA coordinator in the state agency that governs the technical institutes. The six regional education centers in Massachusetts serve a similar function.

Other State Policies Affecting Coordination

Certain state policies and practices that are not specifically directed at JTPA and vocational education coordination still enhance the relationship. Those states that have public technical institutes or vocationally-oriented community colleges (in contrast to transfer-oriented community colleges) are likely to find their local SDAs working with these institutions. Similarly, state-supported area vocational schools with large adult populations naturally offer the vocational training programs used most often by JTPA — open-entry/open-exit, relatively short, and intensive courses.

State funding policies can have powerful influences on coordination. In states where community college funding is strictly a function of enrollment, for example, community colleges receive additional revenue for every additional JTPA client they enroll — providing a fiscal inducement to cooperate with JTPA Where this incentive is limited — as it is, for example in states like Florida where state revenues adjust to enrollments only with a lag, or in California where the state has limited or "capped" the enrollments

that qualify for state funding — these incentives disappear. Quite inadvertently, therefore, the state funding mechanisms for community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools can either enhance or hinder cooperation.

Another state practice that indirectly fosters collaboration is the funding of support services such as counseling, remediation, and placement in postsecondary schools. North Carolina's Participant Service Centers and Human Resource Development programs in community colleges are an excellent example. These projects provide support services that make it much easier for the colleges to serve JTPA clients (Grubb et. al., 1989, pp. 103-115). Elsewhere, as community colleges, technical institutes, and adult schools provide more support services as a matter of state policy, institutions are becoming more compatible with JTPA. Thus, states can enhance coordination between JTPA and vocational education by supporting flexible programs and good support services within the vocational education system.

There are, then, many steps states can take to enhance coordination, going beyond those required by federal legislation. In the *state*-level questionnaires that NAVE will develop, it will be important to determine how common these various types of state-level activities are.

III. ESTABLISHING TRENDS: PRIOR SURVEYS OF COORDINATION

An important question for NAVE is to determine the trend of coordination. Most surveys of administrators agree that coordination has improved (Trutko, Bailis, and Barnow, 1989, pp. 15-17), though some pessimistic observers argue that progress has been painfully slow. Of course, asking state administrators and local providers for their opinions about trends in coordination is not necessarily a reliable approach; it would be better to have earlier studies documenting the extent of coordination that could be used as benchmarks for comparison.

Unfortunately, most studies of coordination have used case study methods rather than surveys, and so cannot provide good answers to

questions of what practices used to be as comparisons with current practice. One exception is the surveys undertaken by the National Alliance of Business in the mid-1980's (Brady and Balfe, 1987). This revealed, for example, that 95 percent of SDAs have some financial agreement with a provider of vocational education. Almost two-thirds of SDAs had a contract with an educational institution to provide vocational skills training, with a significant level contracting with educational institutions for remediation and basic skills. Finally, the survey found high levels of satisfaction: 75 - 80 percent of those surveyed reported the relationship between JTPA and vocational education to be good or excellent.

Similarly, Bailis (1987) conducted an extensive survey of 45 SDAs for the National Commission on Employment Policy. Most of the questions asked opinions about the status of coordination between JTPA and nine different types of institutions, including public education agencies, and opinions about inducements and barriers to coordination. However, the few questions related to cooperative practices again revealed substantial collaboration between JTPA and vocational education: 67 percent of SDAs reported subcontracts with educational institution for classrooms skills training, 45 percent for other classroom training (presumably remedial education) 21 percent for job search assistance, 26 percent for job development, 217 percent for recruitment, 17 percent for ancillary services, 21 percent for on-the-job training, and 5 percent for intake. These results reveal a surprisingly broad range of services provided by educational institutions to JTPA. Unfortunately for NAVE's purposes, this and earlier NAB surveys questioned samples of local JTPA officials, while NAVE will survey local education officials; thus the surveys cannot be directly compared.

However, surveys of educational administrators were undertaken during the 1980s by Lewis, Ferguson, and Card (1987) at the state level, and by Lewis (undated) of local postsecondary providers. The first of these concentrated on priorities for and opinions about the 8-percent funds, concluding that these funds were beneficial to coordination. However, this report provided no real information about local collaborative practices. The survey of postsecondary institutions reported in Lewis (undated) also concentrated on opinions about trends in coordination, but also asked institutions to report whether they provided various services to JTPA. The results, presented here in Table 1, constitute a benchmark of sorts. However,

Table 1

Services Provided under JTPA by Postsecondary Institutions

Services	Percent of Institutions
Training provided	
Enrollment in regular classes on individual referral basis	56
Classes conducted for JTPA clients only	33
Basic/remedial education; GED classes	40
Other Services	
Facilities and/or instructors for classes not conducted by institution itself	64
Intake, assessment, counseling, referral	33
Job development	31
Support services	26
Eligibility certification	13
On-the-job training contracts	11
Youth competency programs	10
Job clubs	9
Acts as administrative entity for SDA	7
Base for percentages	509

NOTE: Total exceeds 100 percent because many institutions provide more than one service

Source: Lewis (undated), Table 3.7, p. 32.

because the response rate was only 52 percent, these results may be quite unreliable. Another survey, again questioning community colleges and technical institutes (with a 72 response rate) rather than JTPA providers, revealed that 53 percent have a contract for training or some other service with JTPA (Lynch, Palmer, and Grubb, 1991). Contrary to the results from Lewis, and to the general perception that community colleges and technical institutes tend to provide classroom instruction in vocational and remedial subjects more than other services, this survey found that postsecondary institutions provided more assessment (to 66 percent of JTPA clients), counseling (65 percent) and job search skills (53 percent) than credit vocational courses (44 percent), remediation (44 percent), and non-credit vocational courses (26 percent). This may reflect the fact that classroom instruction is more expensive, and therefore provided to a smaller proportion of JTPA clients, than are shorter-term and less expensive services.

Shifting to a research based more on case studies than a survey, a recent examination of 15 representative SDAs found that almost all of them depend on public educational institutions — community colleges, technical institutes, and skill centers operated by school districts — for their classroom training. In fact, only two of the fifteen SDAs relied heavily on proprietary schools, and none used community-based organizations for occupational skills training (Kogan et al., 1989, Ch. 2), though in other areas CBOs are extensively used.[6]

It is therefore difficult to find studies that have counts and percentages describing how widespread various coordination practices are. The studies that exist indicate that some form of collaborative service delivery is quite widespread, and that educational institutions provide a surprisingly wide array of services to JTPA. These studies were all undertaken before the JOBS program was enacted, and so fail to provide any information about welfare recipients served by educational institutions.

More common than surveys are case studies, which include those undertaken by NCRVE (Grubb et al. 1989, 1990, and 1991); those funded by the Department of Labor (reviewed in Trutko, Bailis, and Barnow, 1989, which also includes nine case studies); and intensive case studies of all education

---

[6] In the study of eight communities in Grubb and McDonnell (1991), two — Philadelphia and Scranton — rely extensively on CBOs for skill training.

and training providers in eight communities by Grubb and McDonnell (1991). These analyses were all developed for slightly different purposes, and survey different local programs; for example, the NCRVE studies attempted to locate exemplary cases of coordination; the Berkeley Planning Associates study (Kogan et al., 1989) was intended to study the quality of training, not the extent of coordination.

Because of these differences, it is difficult to summarize these studies. Indeed, they can be read either positively, as indicating how widespread coordination is, or negatively, concentrating on the barriers to coordination that are demonstrably present. For purposes of NAVE's surveys, this means that it will be possible to compare results about coordination with earlier studies for only a few questions. Other evidence about trends in coordination will have to be developed with information developed within the NAVE questionnaires. This can be done in two ways: by asking respondents to compare their practices in two years (e.g., 1990-91 and 1992-93); or by simply asking respondents about their opinion of whether coordination has increased or decreased. Such questions have been included in the proposed questions included in the Appendix.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS

In surveying coordination, it is crucial to separate state from local issues. The kinds of coordination that take place locally including collaborative service delivery, as well as collaborative planning. The decisions related to coordination at the state level include not only collaborative planning, but also substantial state decisions about what services are to be provided in those cases where there is state discretion — for example, how JTPA 8-percent funds are used. In addition, since states can go beyond federal requirements (as outlined in Section III above), it is crucial to determine whether there are other state policies that impede or encourage cooperation; this requires questions both at the state level and at the local level.

In addition, it is important to distinguish between coordination in secondary education and coordination in postsecondary education, particularly when examining local coordination efforts. Because the majority of federal programs that might be coordinated with other federal programs

include adults, rather than school-aged individuals, most exemplary coordination efforts involve postsecondary institutions — community colleges, technical institutes, and area vocational schools that enroll adults. (Some area vocational schools enroll both secondary and post-secondary students, and some combine postsecondary and post-secondary students in the same classes and programs, making them difficult to classify.) In contrast, there appear to have many fewer coordinated efforts involving K-12 education. (Grubb et al., 1989, 1990). Most of them have involved JTPA providing extra services for high school students considered at risk of dropping out, or summer programs for high school students which sometimes involve counseling, tutoring, and other services during the school year (as outlined in Model 6 in Section I above). Therefore questions to secondary schools about coordination need to be much less extensive than questions to postsecondary institutions.

Therefore the Appendix to this paper includes four sets of questions:

(1) Questions to the state agency responsible for secondary vocational education. This is usually the single state agency which receives Perkins funds as well.

(2) Questions to the state agency responsible for community colleges, technical institutes, and other postsecondary institutions. In some states there may be more than one such agency.

(3) Questions to local educational agencies.

(4) Questions to local postsecondary institutions.

At the state level the questions concentrate on state decisions and policies that might foster collaborative service delivery at the local level. However, questions 3 through 10 on the first questionnaire also ask about compliance with the formal requirements of the Perkins Amendments. Similarly, the questions to local educational institutions focus on the extent of collaborative service delivery, rather than collaborative planning. Because the nature of cooperation between postsecondary institutions and other federal programs is much more extensive than coordination of secondary institutions, the fourth questionnaire (to postsecondary institutions) is by far the longest.

The questions included are a mixture of closed-ended and open-ended questions. Of course, it would be desirable to limit these protocols to closed-ended questions, which would facilitate descriptive statistics and

generalizations across educational institutions. Unfortunately, in my experience the range of coordination practices is so great that closed-ended responses cannot possibly capture all the practices that are likely to exist. Therefore, the questions I have included typically pose a closed-ended question, and then ask respondents to elaborate as appropriate.

Prior surveys of administrators have included many questions which elicit opinions about the status and trend of coordination. It is always difficult to interpret the results since administrators may attempt to cast coordination in a positive light, since coordination is an obvious federal goal; in addition, it is never clear what standard administrators use to assess what "good coordination" might mean. For these reasons, the questions included in this report are largely confined to those about practices, rather than opinions. The single exception is that each question asks respondents to report their opinions about trends toward the end of the questionnaire.

One of the important issues to explore in these question is the nature of state-local relationships. In earlier case studies (e.g., Grubb, 1989 and 1990), it has become clear that *state* perceptions of policies and *local* perceptions can be quite different. In particular, state policies to enhance coordination often end up being quite burdensome on local institutions, without achieving their desired effects of enhancing coordination. Therefore various questions to local institutions are included to determine the nature of state-local relationships.

A few issues about these questionnaires cannot be resolved at this time. One involves possible changes in JTPA legislation, including the elimination of the 8-percent set-aside and the 6-percent governor's incentive set-aside. If these are eliminated or changed, the questionnaires should be modified accordingly. In this case, it might be appropriate to ask what practices were before changes in JTPA, and then what changes are projected. Similarly, it is possible that new JTPA legislation will include some kind of state-level super-council establishing policies for all federal programs; in that case, some of the state-level questions about the state board for vocational education will be obsolete. Again, it would then be possible to ask about practices before the change and those projected as a result of the new legislation.

The questions contained in the appendix ask about practices, enrollments, and funding patterns during 1991-92, on the assumption that NAVE surveys of state and local programs will take place during 1992-93. If

the surveys take place earlier in 1992, however, then questions related to the 1991-92 school year will need to be rephrased.

The questionnaires included in the appendix are relatively long, particularly the one for local postsecondary programs (because these are the institutions which have the most interaction with other federal programs). If space becomes a serious constraint on the length of questionnaires, it will be necessary to establish priorities. In general, I would recommend that questions concerning JTPA be given priority over questions related to other federal programs, largely because coordination with JTPA is the most common form of coordination and because the Perkins Amendments mention JTPA much more frequently than other programs. In addition, I recommend that priority be given to questions that ask what policies and practices are, rather than questions asking about opinions or intentions. These two criteria imply that the most important questions are the following:

State secondary agency: I.2 and I.23 to I.25 on state uses of 8-percent funds.

State postsecondary agency: II.2 and II.3 on state policies to encourage coordination.

Local secondary institutions: III.2, 3, and 4 on receipt of JTPA funds; questions III.6 and 7 on receipt of JOBS funds.

Local postsecondary institutions: Questions IV.2 to IV.7 on receipt and use of JTPA funds; questions IV.9, 10, and 11 on JOBS funds; questions IV.16 and 17 on remedial/developmental education.

Finally, the questions included in the Appendix assume that there will be other, general questions asked at both state and local levels that can be used for standardization. For example, questions about funding from JTPA or JOBS are not especially meaningful without information about overall funding levels of institutions, and enrollment figures similarly require total enrollments to interpret the results.

REFERENCES

Bailis, Lawrence (1987). *The More Things Change ... A Study of PY85 JTPA Coordination and PY84 JTPA Program Activities.* Washington D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy.

Bailis, Lawrence (1987, May). *Study of the Status of PY85 JTPA Coordination and PY84 JTPA Program Activities.* Washington D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, Research Report RR-87-26.

Brady, Elaine, and Balfe, Kevin (1987). *JTPA Operations at the Local Level: Coordination or Discord?* Washington D.C.: National Alliance of Business.

Cook, Robert et al. (1985). *Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act: Final Report.* Rockville MD.: Westat Inc. for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

Dickinson, Katherine et al. (1988). *Evaluation of the Effects of JTPA Performance Standards on Clients, Services, and Costs.* Washington D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, Research Report No. 88-15 (September).

Figueroa, Jose, and Silvanik, Robert (1989). *The Provision of Education and Other Services in State Welfare-to-Work Programs.* Washington D.C.: National Governors' Association.

Grubb, W. Norton, Brown, Cynthia, Kaufman, Phillip, and Lederer, John (1989, April). *Innovation Versus Turf: Coordination Between Vocational Education and Job Training Partnership Act Programs.* Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The University of California, Berkeley.

Grubb, W. Norton, Brown, Cynthia, Kaufman, Phillip, and Lederer, John (1990, August). *Order Amidst Complexity: The Status of Coordination Among Vocational Education, Job Training Partnership Act, and Welfare-to-Work Programs.* Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The University of California, Berkeley.

Grubb, W. Norton, and McDonnell, Lorraine (1991). *Local Systems of Work-Related Education and Job Training: Interdependence, Diversity, and Effectiveness.* Santa Monica and Berkeley: RAND and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Hickey, Delina (1986, Spring). "Coordination Between JTPA and Vocational Education: A Case Study of the Eight Percent Set-Aside", National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, *Facts and Findings*.

Kogan, Deborah et al. (1989). *Improving the Quality of Training Under JTPA*. Berkeley Planning Associates and SRI International for the U.S. Department of Labor (November 15).

Lewis, Morgan (1986, Spring). "Cross-references in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the Job Training Partnership Act", National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, *Facts and Findings*.

Lewis, Morgan (undated). *Vocational Education-Job Training Partnership Act Coordination: Second Annual Report*. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

Lewis, Morgan, Ferguson, Marilyn, and Card, Michael (1987). *Vocational Education-Job Training Partnership Act Coordination: First Annual Report*. Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

Lynch, Robert, Palmer, James, and Grubb, W. Norton (1991). *Community College Involvement in Contract Training and Other Economic Development Activities*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The University of California, Berkeley.

Trutko, John, Bailis, Larry, and Barnow, Burt (1989, December 29). *An Assessment of the JTPA Role in State and Local Coordination Activities*. Vol. I: Draft Final Report. Vol. II: Case Studies. Washington D.C.: James Bell Associates and Lewin/ICF for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

APPENDIX
SUGGESTED QUESTIONS

I. Questionnaire to the state agency responsible for secondary vocational education

NOTE: This agency will in most states be the single state agency that receives Perkins funds. In a few states, a postsecondary or other agency will be the single state agency.

1. Does your agency have any regular interaction with any of the following state agencies? For what purposes?

State Job Training Coordination Council and/or the state agency administering the JTPA program?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Design of joint service delivery ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for welfare (AFDC) and the JOBS program?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Design of joint service delivery ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for adult basic education?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Design of joint service delivery ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for apprenticeship programs?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Design of joint service delivery ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for vocational rehabilitation?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Design of joint service delivery ___
- Other (describe below) ___

2. Does the state have any other formal or informal arrangements for coordinating the operations of different federally-funded education and training programs with each other, or with related state programs?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what other coordinating mechanisms are used?

Other planning activities? ___
A superagency of some kind? ___
Targeting of funds? ___
Decisions about what services to provide? ___
Decisions about priorities among individuals? ___
Other ___

Please describe these activities in greater detail.

3. What procedures has the state board for vocational education established for coordination with the State Job Training Coordinating Council? Please provide any written documentation of these procedures.

4. How has the state assured that local recipients of Perkins funds comply with provision of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Education of the Handicapped Act regarding access to programs? Please provide any written documentation of these assurances.

5. Does the state board of education provide lists of recipients of Perkins funds to local PICs? If so, please provide a copy of the most recent such list.

6. Does the State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) include any representatives from the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC)?

Yes ___ Names _____
No ___ _____

7. Does the State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) include any representatives from local PICs?

Yes ___ Names _____
No _____

8. When did the State Council on Vocational Education last report on the integration and coordination of vocational education with the job training system?

When is the next such report scheduled? _____

9. Is the planning periods for state vocational education plans coterminous with JTPA planning periods?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, please provide a schedule of both planning periods.

10. Does the state Committee of Practitioners include any members of PICs?

Yes ___ Names _____
No ___ _____

If not were members of local PICs consulted in choosing members of the Committee of Practitioners?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, please describe how.

11. Title II, Part A authorizes funding for community-based organizations to provide support programs for vocational education. Has your state allocated funds for this purpose?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how much was allocated to CBO's in 1991-92?

$_____

Please describe what these funds were used for.

12. Title II, Part II of the Perkins Amendments authorizes funds for business-labor-education partnerships (including apprenticeships and internships in industry), with the requirement that there be incentives for coordination between such partnerships and JTPA programs. Has your state funded any such partnerships?

Yes ____

No ____

If yes, please describe what these funds were used for.

13. Title II, Part G of the Perkins Amendments authorizes Community Education Employment Centers, for low-income youth. Has your state funded any such centers?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe what these funds were used for.

14. Section 413 of the Perkins Amendments authorizes the Secretary of Education to establish demonstration programs for dislocated workers through organizations eligible under JTPA. Has your state received any funding to establish such programs.

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe what these funds were used for.

15. Section 420A of the Perkins Amendments authorizes cooperative demonstration programs for a variety of purposes including examples of "successful cooperation between the private sector and public agencies", grants to community-based organizations in partnership with educational institutions, and agricultural action centers that must be coordinated with programs under Title III of JTPA. Has your state funded any of these demonstration programs?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe what these funds were used for.

16. Section 511 allows Perkins funds to be used to provide additional funding to programs funded by Sections 123, Title II, and Title III of JTPA and to programs supported by the Wagner-Payser Act (which supports the Employment Service). Has your state used any of its discretionary Perkins funds to such programs?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe what these funds have been used for.

17. Do you have information at the state level about the amount of funding from JTPA that supports students enrolled in high schools?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how much was this in 1991-92? $_____

What have these funds typically been spent for?

18. Do you have information at the state level about the amount of funding from the state welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) that supports students enrolled in high schools?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how much was this in 1991-92? $_____

What have these funds typically been spent for?

19. Do high schools in your state use any other federal programs related to vocational education and job training, including apprenticeship programs, vocational rehabilitation programs, and the Employment Services? If so, which ones?

Apprenticeship programs ___
Vocational rehabilitation ___
Employment Service ___
Other (describe) ___

20. Do you have information at the state level about the numbers of students served or amounts of funding from these other federal programs — including apprenticeship programs, vocational rehabilitation programs, and the Employment Service — that supported high school students in 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what were enrollments in each federal program?

How much federal resources were received by high schools?

What have these funds typically been spent for?

21. Does the state board for vocational education participate in decisions about how JTPA 8-percent funds are spent?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how does the state board participate?

22. What state agency administers the 8-percent funds?

---

23. How are JTPA 8-percent funds allocated in your state?[7]

By formula ___
By RFP ___
By a combination of formula and RFP ___
Other (please describe) ___

Please describe in greater detail the formula and/or the RFP mechanism.

24. Who are the recipients of 8-percent funds?

SDA's ___
School districts ___
Community colleges and other postsecondary institutions ___
Consortia of SDA's and local educational institutions ___
Other ___

Please include a listing of all recipients of 8-percent funds, with amounts and purposes, for 1991-92.

[7] NOTE: If proposed JTPA legislation changing or eliminating the 8-percent funds is enacted, these questions will need to be modified.

25. What priorities have been established for the use of 8-percent funds? Please describe.

26. Have the state's governors used the JTPA 6-percent incentive funds to promote state priorities? If so, how?

Has coordination among programs been one of these priorities? If so, please describe how.

27. In your view, what has been the trend in the last three to five years in coordination between vocational education and JTPA programs?

Much improved	___
Somewhat improved	___
About the same	___
Somewhat worse	___
Much worse	___

28. In your view, what has been the trend in the last two to three years in coordination between vocational education and JOBS programs?

Much improved	___
Somewhat improved	___
About the same	___
Somewhat worse	___
Much worse	___

29. Are state agencies, or the state legislature, or the governor contemplating any changes in the state's policy toward coordination among education and job training programs? If so, please describe.

II. Questionnaire for State Postsecondary Agency[8]

1. Does your agency have any regular interaction with any of the following state agencies?

State Job Training Coordination Council — Yes ____ / No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for welfare (AFDC) and the JOBS program?

Yes ___ / No ___

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for adult basic education

Yes ____ / No ____

If yes, of what type?

- Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
- Joint membership ___
- Sharing state plans ___
- Joint planning (describe below) ___
- Other (describe below) ___

[8] NOTE: In some state — for example, those with both community colleges and technical institutes — there may be more the one postsecondary agency. In others, some institutions providing postsecondary vocational education will be governed by the state's K-12 agency; this is particularly true of area vocational schools serving both secondary and postsecondary students.

State agency responsible for apprenticeship programs?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
Joint membership ___
Sharing state plans ___
Joint planning (describe below) ___
Other (describe below) ___

State agency responsible for vocational rehabilitation?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, of what type?

Regular meetings of subcommittees ___
Joint membership ___
Sharing state plans ___
Joint planning (describe below) ___
Other (describe below) ___

2. Does the state have any other formal or informal arrangements for coordinating the operations of different federally-funded education and training programs with each other, or with related state programs?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what coordinating mechanisms are used?

Other planning activities? ___
A superagency of some kind? ___
Targeting of funds? ___
Decisions about what services to provide? ___
Decisions about priorities among individuals? ___
Other ___

Please describe these activities in greater detail.

3. Does your state have any other policies intended to encourage cooperation between postsecondary educational institutions, JTPA, AFDC, and other employment-related programs?

Encouragement of flexible programs including short courses, open-entry/open-exit courses and other non-traditional formats? ___
Funding for assessment/remediation/counseling centers? ___
Funding for "one-stop" education and training centers? ___
Other (please describe) ___

4. Do you have information at the state level about the enrollments and/or the amount of funding from JTPA that supported students enrolled in postsecondary institutions during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how many students? _____
How much revenue? $_____

What have these funds typically been spent for?

5. Do you have information at the state level about the enrollment from and/or the amount of funding from the state welfare-to-work programs (JOBS) that supported students enrolled in postsecondary institutions during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how many students? _____
How much revenue? $_____

What have these funds typically been spent for?

6. Do postsecondary institutions in your state use any other federal programs related to vocational education and job training, including apprenticeship programs, vocational rehabilitation programs, and the Employment Services? If so, which ones?

Apprenticeship programs	___
Vocational rehabilitation	___
Employment Service	___
Other (describe)	___

Do you have information at the state level about the numbers of students served or amounts of funding from these other federal programs including apprenticeship programs, vocational rehabilitation programs, and the Employment Services that supported students enrolled in postsecondary institutions during 1991-92?

Yes	___
No	___

If yes, what were enrollments, in which federal programs?

How much federal resources were received by postsecondary institutions?

What were these funds typically spent for?

7. Does your agency participate in decisions about how JTPA 8-percent funds are spent?[9]

Yes	___
No	___

If yes, how does the agency participate?

8. What priorities have been established in your state for the use of 8-percent funds? Please describe.

9. Do you have information at the state level about the enrollment and/or the amount of funding from 8-percent funds received by postsecondary institutions during 1991-92?

---

[9] NOTE: If proposed JTPA legislation changing or eliminating the 8-percent set-aside or the 6-percent governor's incentive grants is enacted, these questions will need to be modified.

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how many students? ______
How much revenue? $_____

What were these funds typically spent for?

10. Have the state's governors used the JTPA 6-percent incentive funds to promote state priorities? If so, how?

Has coordination among programs been one of these priorities? If so, please describe how.

11. In your view, what has been the trend in the last three to five years in coordination between vocational education and JTPA programs?

Much improved ___
Somewhat improved ___
About the same ___
Somewhat worse ___
Much worse ___

12. In your view, what has been the trend in the last three to five years in coordination between vocational education and JOBS programs?

Much improved ___
Somewhat improved ___
About the same ___
Somewhat worse ___
Much worse ___

13. Are state agencies, or the state legislature, or the governor contemplating any changes in the state's policy toward coordination among education and job training programs? Is so, please describe.

III. Questions for Local High Schools and Area Vocational School (serving secondary students)

1. Is any official from your school district a member of:

The local Private Industry Council (PIC)?

Yes ___
No ___

A planning group for the welfare-to-work (JOBS) program?

Yes ___
No ___

A local planning council related to adult basic education or remedial education, or a literacy council?

Yes ___
No ___

Any other local planning or coordination group involving vocational education, job training, or other employment-related services?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, please describe.

2. Did any students in your high school receive services funded by JTPA during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what kinds of services were these?

Summer employment ___
Work experience programs ___
Counseling during the school year ___
Remediation/tutoring during the school year ___
Others (please describe) ___

How were these students selected?

By high school administrators ___
By JTPA administrators ___
Jointly by JTPA and high school administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By high school administrators	___
By JTPA administrators	___
Jointly by JTPA and high school administrators	___
Other method (please describe)	___

3. Did the school district provide any of its own funds for these students or this program?

Yes	___
No	___

If yes, how much school district revenue? $_____
How much JTPA revenue? $_____

How many students were supported in this way? _____

4. Did your district receive any JTPA 8-percent funds during 1991-92?

Yes	___
No	___

If yes, what amount of funds? $_____

Please describe what these funds were used for.

5. If you answered no to questions 2 and 4, what has prevented you from providing services jointly with JTPA? (Check all that apply.)

Different purposes and goals	___
Incompatible schedules for courses/classes	___
Incompatible planning cycles, fiscal years, or geographic areas	___
Difficulty in meeting JTPA performance standards	___
Lack of cooperation from JTPA staff	___
Inadequate resources from JTPA	___
Burdensome paperwork or reporting requirements	___
Political barriers/resistance	___
JTPA clients poorly prepared	___
Lack of state or institutional resources for JTPA clients	___
Lack of time or resources for coordination	___
Other (please describe)	___

6. Did any students enrolled in your high school receive services funded by welfare-to-work (JOBS) programs during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what kinds of services were these?

Summer employment ___
Work experience programs ___
Counseling during the school year ___
Remediation/tutoring during the school year ___
Child care ___
Others (please describe) ___

How were these students selected?

By high school administrators ___
By welfare administrators ___
Jointly by welfare and high school administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By high school administrators ___
By welfare administrators ___
Jointly by welfare and high school administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

7. Did the school district provide any of its own funds for these students or this program?

Yes ___
No ___

How much welfare revenue did the school receive?

$_____

How many students were supported in this way? _____

8. Did any students enrolled in your high school receive any services of the following kinds during 1991-92?

Apprenticeship programs?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, numbers enrolled _____

Employment Service?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, numbers referred _____

9. Section 235(c)(2)(n) of the Perkins Amendments allows federal funds to be directed to "private vocational training institutions, private postsecondary educational institutions, employers, labor organizations, and and joint labor-management apprenticeship programs whenever [they] can make a significant contribution to obtaining the objectives of the State plan and can provide substantially equivalent training at lesser cost, or can provide equipment of services not available in public institutions". Have you used any of your Perkins funds for these purposes?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe how much money was spent in such institutions and for what purposes.

10. In your view, what has been the trend in the last three to five years in coordination between vocational education and JTPA programs?

Much improved ___
Somewhat improved ___
About the same ___
Somewhat worse ___
Much worse ___

11. Does your district have any plans to develop additional programs to coordinate programs for high school students with JTPA, JOBS, or other federal programs? If so, please describe.

IV. Questions to Postsecondary Educational Institutions

1. Is your institution formally represented on:

The local Private Industry Council (PIC)?

Yes ___
No ___

A planning group for the welfare-to-work (JOBS) program?

Yes ___
No ___

A local planning council related to adult basic education or remedial education, or a literacy council?

Yes ___
No ___

Any other local planning or coordination group involving vocational education, job training, or other employment-related services?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, please describe.

2. Is your institution the local administrative entity for JTPA?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what is the administrative relationship of the JTPA division to the rest of the institution?

JTPA division under the vocational education division ___
JTPA division independent of the vocational education division ___
JTPA division reports to an academic dean ___
JTPA division reports to a dean for contract education ___
JTPA division reports directly to the president ___
Other (please describe) ___

What difference has the location of the JTPA administrative entity within your institution made to the other programs of the institution?

3. Did your institution provide classroom instruction for any JTPA clients during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes:

Were these students enrolled in:
regularly-scheduled classes? ___
special classes only for JTPA clients? ___

How many JTPA clients were enrolled in the following during 1991-92?
Vocational Associate programs? _____
Vocational certificate programs? _____
Short-term or non-credit vocational programs _____
Remedial or developmental education _____
ESL programs _____
Other (please describe) _____

What amounts of resources came from the following sources to support these students?
Regular state aid $_____
Other institutional resources $_____
JTPA resources $_____

How were these students selected?

By your administrators ___
By JTPA administrators ___
Jointly by JTPA and your administrators ___
By self-referral ___
Other methods (please describe) ___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By your administrators ___
By JTPA administrators ___
Jointly by JTPA and your administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

4. Did your institution provide any of the following services for JTPA clients during 1991-92?

Assessment	_____	Numbers served _____
Counseling	_____	Numbers served _____
Job placement	_____	Numbers served _____
On-the-job training contracts	_____	Numbers served _____
Job clubs or job search assistance	_____	Numbers served _____

For these services, what amounts of resources came from the following sources?

Regular state aid	$_____
Other institutional resources	$_____
JTPA resources	$_____

5. Were JTPA clients in your institution supported by performance-based contracts?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, please describe the nature of the performance contracting mechanisms, including benchmarks for payment.

Did the institution receive 100 percent of contract payments, or a smaller fraction?

6. Did any regularly-enrolled students in your institution receive services funded by JTPA during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what kinds of services were these?

Support services like child care, transportation, etc.	___
Counseling during the school year	___
Remediation/tutoring during the school year	___
Work experience or on-the-job training	___
Job search assistance	___
Others (please describe)	___

How were these students selected?

By your administrators	___
By JTPA administrators	___
Jointly by JTPA and your administrators	___
By self-referral	___
Other method (please describe)	___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By your administrators	___
By JTPA administrators	___
Jointly by JTPA and your administrators	___
Other method (please describe)	___

How much JTPA revenue supported these students $_____

How many students were supported in this way? _____

7. Did your institution receive any JTPA 8-percent funds during 1991-92?

Yes	___
No	___

If yes, what amount of funds? $_____

Please describe what these funds were used for.

8. If you answered no to questions 3, 4, 5, and 6, what has prevented you from providing services jointly with JTPA? (Check all that apply.)

Different purposes and goals	___
Incompatible schedules for courses/classes	___
Incompatible planning cycles, fiscal years, or geographic areas	___
Difficulty in meeting JTPA performance standards	___
Lack of cooperation from JTPA staff	___
Inadequate resources from JTPA	___
Burdensome paperwork or reporting requirements	___
Political barriers/resistance	___
JTPA clients poorly prepared	___
Lack of state or institutional resources for JTPA clients	___
Lack of time or resources for coordination	___
Other (please describe)	___

9. Did your institution provide classroom instruction for any welfare-to-work (JOBS) clients during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes:

Were these students enrolled in:

regularly-scheduled classes? ___
special classes only for JOBS clients? ___

How many JOBS clients were in the following during 1991-92?

Vocational Associate programs? _____
Vocational certificate programs? _____
Short-term or non-credit vocational programs _____
Remedial or developmental education _____
ESL programs _____
Other (please describe) _____

What amounts of resources came from the following sources?

Regular state aid $_____
Others institutional resources $_____
JOBS resources $_____

How were these students selected?

By your administrators ___
By JOBS administrators ___
Jointly by JOBS and your administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By your administrators ___
By JOBS administrators ___
Jointly by JOBS and your administrators ___
Other method (please describe) ___

10. Did your institution provide any of the following services for JOBS clients in 1991-92?

Assessment	_____	Numbers served _____
Counseling	_____	Numbers served _____
Job placement	_____	Numbers served _____
On-the-job training contracts	_____	Numbers served _____
Job clubs	_____	Numbers served _____

For these services, what amounts of resources came from the following sources?

Regular state aid	$_____
Other institutional resources	$_____
JOBS resources	$_____

11. Did any regularly enrolled students enrolled in your institution receive services funded by welfare-to-work (JOBS) programs during 1991-92?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what kinds of services were these?

Support services like child care, transportation, etc.	___
Counseling during the school year	___
Remediation/tutoring during the school year	___
Job search assistance	___
Work experience or on-the-job training	___
Others (please describe)	___

How were these students selected?

By your administrators	___
By welfare administrators	___
Jointly by welfare and your administrators	___
Other method (please describe)	___

How were these services, or this program, planned?

By your administrators	___
By welfare administrators	___
Jointly by welfare and your administrators	___
Other method (please describe)	___

12. Did your institution provide any of its own funds for these students or this program?

Yes, normal state aid	___
Yes, other local support	___
No	___

If yes, how much institutional resources?	$_____
How much JOBS revenue?	$_____

How many students were supported in this way? _____

13. If you answered no to questions 8, 9, and 10, what has prevented you from working with JOBS? (Check all that apply.)

Different purposes and goals	___
Incompatible schedules for courses/classes	___
Incompatible planning cycles, fiscal years, or geographic areas	___
Difficulty in meeting JOBS performance standards	___
Lack of cooperation from JOBS staff	___
Inadequate resources from JOBS	___
Burdensome paperwork or reporting requirements	___
Political barriers/resistance	___
JOBS clients poorly prepared	___
Lack of state or institutional resources for JOBS clients	___
Lack of time or resources for coordination	___
Other (please describe)	___

14. Has state policy helped or impeded your efforts to coordinate with JTPA and/or the JOBS program? In what ways?

Encouragement:

Strong state leadership	___
Coordination of planning among state agencies	___
Provision of state resources for JTPA/JOBS clients	___
State-required local coordination councils	___
Priorities for JTPA 8-percent fund	___
State efforts to reduce paperwork, reporting requirements, other administrative burdens	___
State efforts to coordinate planning cycles, geographical boundaries, etc.	___
Other (please describe)	___

Discouragement:

Lack of strong state encouragement/support.	___
Lack of planning among state agencies	___
Lack of state resources for JTPA/JOBS clients	___
Priorities for JTPA 8-percent funds	___
Other (please describe)	___

15. Does your institutions provide remedial or developmental education?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes:
How many students were enrolled during 1991-92?

_____

How were these programs funded?

Regular state appropriates	$_____
Special state appropriations for developmental education	$_____
Local institutional resources	$_____
Federal funds: Perkins Act	$_____
Federal funds: Adult Education Act	$_____
Other federal funds (describe)	$_____

16. Does your institution coordinate with other providers of remedial education or adult basic education in your community, for example by accepting students from other programs or referring your students to other programs? Please describe.

17. Do you have an initial placement test or other assessment before students can enroll in vocational courses?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, what happens to students who fall below the minimum score for enrollment?

Referred to remedial education in your institution before enrolling in vocational courses	___
Referred to remedial education in your institution at the same time as enrolling in vocational courses	___

Referred to adult basic education elsewhere in the community before enrolling in vocational courses ___

Other (please describe) ___

18. Does your institution provide customized training for specific firms?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, are JTPA and JOBS clients normally included in such customized training?

Yes ___
No ___

19. Does your institution provide classroom instruction for any apprenticeship programs?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how many students were enrolled during 1991-92?

_____

Did the institution receive any special funding for this program?

Federal resources $_____
Other state resources $_____
Union resources $_____
Company resources $_____

No special resources ___

20. Does your institution provide classroom instruction for any vocational rehabilitation programs?

Yes ___
No ___

If yes, how many students were enrolled during 1991-92?

_____

Did the institution receive any special funding for this program?

Federal resources $_____
Other state resources $_____
Union resources $_____

No special resources ___

21. Does your institution make use of the local Employment Service in any way?

Yes ___
No ___

If so, how many students were referred during 1991-92?

_____

Please describe this program in greater detail.

22. Section 235(c)(2)(n) of the Perkins Amendments allows federal funds to be directed to "private vocational training institutions, private postsecondary educational institutions, employers, labor organizations, and and joint labor-management apprenticeship programs whenever [they] can make a significant contribution to obtaining the objectives of the State plan and can provide substantially equivalent training at lesser cost, or can provide equipment of services not available in public institutions". Have you used any of your Perkins funds for these purposes?

Yes ____
No ____

If yes, please describe how much money was spent in such institutions and for what purposes.

23. In your view, what has been the trend in the last three to five years in coordination between vocational education and JTPA programs?

Much improved ___
Somewhat improved ___
About the same ___
Somewhat worse ___
Much worse ___

24. In your view, what has been the trend in the last two to three years in coordination between vocational education and JOBS programs?

Much improved ___
Somewhat improved ___
About the same ___
Somewhat worse ___
Much worse ___

25. Does your institution have any plans to develop additional programs to coordinate programs for postsecondary students with JTPA, JOBS, or other federal programs? If so, please describe.